

Appl. No.: 10/583,287
Reply to Office Action of: 05/15/2008

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 7 10, 11, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ittah et al. (US 5,575,685). The examiner is requested to reconsider this rejection.

Claim 1 has been amended above to claim that the first locking device is adapted to lock only the first contacts with the housing, and that the second locking device is adapted to lock only the second contacts with the housing. In Ittah et al., the locking key 30 cannot lock any of the contacts in the housing without also using the locking members 12. The combined features of claim 1 are not disclosed or suggested in the cited art. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable and should be allowed.

Though the claims dependent upon claim 1 contain their own allowable subject matter, these claims should at least be allowable due to their dependence from allowable claim 1. However, to expedite prosecution at this time, no further comment will be made.

Independent claim 10 has been amended to claim that the second contacts have a different shape than the first contacts. In Ittah et al. the contacts 2 all have the same shape. Ittah et al. does not disclose or suggest a first locking device configured to directly lock the first contacts with the housing and a second locking device configured to directly lock the second contacts with the housing, wherein the first and second contacts have different shapes. The combined features of claim 10 are not disclosed or suggested in the

Appl. No.: 10/583,287
Reply to Office Action of: 05/15/2008

cited art. Therefore, claim 10 is patentable and should be allowed.

Though the claims dependent upon claim 10 contain their own allowable subject matter, these claims should at least be allowable due to their dependence from allowable claim 10. However, to expedite prosecution at this time, no further comment will be made.

Independent claim 19 claims that the housing is sized and shaped to receive first contacts and differently shaped second contacts, and that the system for preventing the second locking device from moving comprises a portion spaced from the first locking device when the first locking device is in the release position, wherein the portion is configured to contact the second locking device to prevent the second locking device from moving from the release position to the locking position. In Ittah et al. there is no disclosure or suggestion of the housing being sized and shaped to receive first contacts and differently shaped second contacts. In Ittah et al. there is no disclosure or suggestion of a system for preventing the second locking device from moving comprises a portion spaced from the first locking device when the first locking device is in the release position, wherein the portion is configured to contact the second locking device to prevent the second locking device from moving from the release position to the locking position as claimed in claim 19. Ittah et al. merely discloses a locking key 30 to prevent the locking members 12 from moving (wherein the locking members 12 can prevent the locking key 30 from being moved to its locking position). The features of claim 19 are not disclosed or suggested in the

Appl. No.: 10/583,287
Reply to Office Action of: 05/15/2008

cited art. Therefore, claim 19 is patentable and should be allowed.

Independent claim 20 claims that the system for preventing the second locking device from moving comprises a portion spaced from the first locking device when the first locking device is in the release position. In Ittah et al. only the locking members 12 prevent the locking key 30 from moving to its locking position. Ittah et al. does not disclose or suggest a system for preventing the locking key 30 from moving comprises a portion spaced from the locking members 12 when the locking members 12 are in their release position. The features of claim 20 are not disclosed or suggested in the cited art. Therefore, claim 20 is patentable and should be allowed.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issue remain, the examiner is invited to call applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark F. Harrington
Mark F. Harrington (Reg. No. 31,686)

Date

9/12/08

Customer No.: 29683
Harrington & Smith, PC
4 Research Drive
Shelton, CT 06484-6212
203-925-9400

SEP. 12. 2008 2:15PM

HARRINGTON & SMITH

NO. 757 P. 14

Appl. No.: 10/583,287
Reply to Office Action of: 05/15/2008

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

9/12/2008
Date

Dale Langeth
Name of Person Making Deposit